

MAY 17 1982

Christian Order



Summary of Contents for April, 1982

CHILDREN AT RISK	<i>Joanna Bogle</i>
PATRIOTISM: A CHRISTIAN VIRTUE	<i>Anthony Cooney</i>
POPE LEO XIII ON TRUE LIBERTY	<i>Michael Davies</i>
MY DREAM	<i>J. C. L. Inman</i>
THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN BRITAIN, 1981	<i>Nicole Hall</i>
DEMYTHOLOGIZED CATECHETICS	<i>Edith Myers</i>
THE HUMAN PREDICAMENT	<i>Mary A. Lynch</i>
SECULARISM AND THE SUPERNATURAL: 2	<i>The Editor</i>

We are pulling out of the hard time now; meaning by this that the months of very heavy pressure (December to April) are just about over. We are grateful for the pressure, for it has come from the great volume of renewals and new subscriptions that have come in. Have you sent in your's yet in answer to our reminder? It would be great if you would do so without delay. Thank you so very much.

—Paul Crane, S.J.

Cum Permissu Superiorum

Contents

Page

- 194 OUT OF PLACE *The Editor*
- 196 MY DREAM *J. C. L. Inman*
- 201 LETTER TO MY PARISH
PRIEST *R. S.*
- 203 CHILDREN AT RISK
Joanna Bogle
- 207 PATRIOTISM: A CHRISTIAN
VIRTUE *Anthony Cooney*
- 211 SECULARISM AND THE
SUPERNATURAL: 2 *The Editor*
- 223 THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN
BRITAIN, 1981 *Nicole Hall*
- 226 DEMYTHOLOGIZED
CATECHETICS *Edith Myers*
- 235 THE ETERNAL SKY
Burke Cosgrove
- 237 POPE LEO XIII ON TRUE
LIBERTY *Michael Davies*
- 246 THE HUMAN PREDICAMENT
Mary A. Lynch
- 254 BOOK REVIEWS
Francis Fenn, S.J.

If You Change Your Address :

Please let us know two or three weeks ahead if possible and please send us both new and old addresses. Thank you.

Christian Order is a magazine devoted to Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs in Church and State; at home and abroad; in the political, social and industrial fields. It is published ten times a year.

It is published by Father Paul Crane, S.J., from 65, Belgrave Rd., London S.W.1V, 2BG. This is the sole postal address to which all communications concerning *Christian Order* should be sent.

Christian Order is obtainable only by subscription and from this address. In the case of those desiring more than one copy, these are obtainable at the subscription rate and should be paid for in advance.

The annual subscription to *Christian Order* is £3 in the United Kingdom and Republic of Ireland; \$5.00 in the United States, Canada and Australia; elsewhere according to the approximate sterling rate of exchange, in the currency of the country concerned or any convenient currency.

Air-mail rates as follows :

U.S.A., Canada

India, etc.—£6, U.S. \$15

Australia—£7, A. \$15

N. Zealand—£7, N.Z. \$15

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

VOLUME 23

APRIL

NO. 4

Out of Place

THE EDITOR

IF I remember rightly — though I confess I took scant notice of the allegation at the time — *Christian Order* was described by a columnist in the *Catholic Herald* at the end of last year as radical in its social philosophy, particularly with reference to the developing countries; but in other matters of Catholic teaching and practice “very old fashioned”.

The contrast made me smile. Presumably, one is off the rails of current acceptability within the post-conciliar Church unless one is radical not only within the field of Catholic Social Teaching, but within that of doctrinal teaching and practice as well. (Kindly note, *en passant*, the false parallel here; “radical”, applied to teaching and practice, is taken to mean “new-wave” or “progressive”, which is not the same thing at all.) I must confess that I have never sought to be on the rails where what passes for the post-conciliar Church is concerned. My only desire is to hold to the truth—doctrinal, moral and social—as consigned by Christ to the keeping of His Church and given by her to men. Over the years I have studied that truth in the social field and come to the conclusion that you cannot accept it in its entirety without, at the same time, being totally radical in outlook. For that truth puts man—God’s most marvellous piece of work on earth—at the centre of things:

and to do that is the most radical thing you can do at this or any other day. By contrast, contemporary Capitalism places him at the margin of society and contemporary Communism at its bottom. Each in its own way, therefore, though in different ways and degrees, represents a good deal more than the first beginning of a return to the slave society of ancient times. Each, therefore, is utterly reactionary. Catholic Social Teaching is necessarily opposed to both systems. It must be because it places man, not at the margin or at the bottom, but at the centre of things, as Pope John Paul has emphasised again and again in his encyclical, *Laborem Exercens*. Catholic Social Teaching, therefore, is of its essence radical. To remark, as the *Herald* writer did of *Christian Order*, that it is radical in its social outlook is simply to say that it accepts the truth of Catholic Teaching. Of course it does. A Catholic periodical can do nothing else.

I am grateful to the *Herald* columnist for this compliment; but I cannot compliment him on his consistency. *Christian Order* is loyal to the truth of Catholic Social Teaching. For this it is complimented. It is loyal to the truth of the Church's doctrinal teaching and practice. For this it is chided; called "old-fashioned". The inconsistency is not merely patent, but pathetic. For it matters not a hoot whether a point-of-view be called radical, old-fashioned or out-of-date; or whether he who holds it be classified as one of yesterday's men or tomorrow's latest batch of whizz-kids. The only thing that matters is that the point-of-view in question should be in accordance with God's truth and that he who holds it should cling to it and uphold it for this reason alone. All else is nonsense; the somewhat disreputable slogan-mongering of the *Herald* columnist out of place, therefore, in this context. Decent Catholic journalism—if there is such a thing left in this country—should have learnt long since to do without it.

Taking a leaf out of Cardinal Hume's book on the principle that cats can look at kings, the Author of this article sets down his own dream, which he attributes to the year 2010 A.D.

My Dream

A LAYMAN'S VIEW

J. C. L. INMAN

IF in the Church the principle applies that cats may look at kings, I should like to take a leaf out of Cardinal Hume's book and articulate my dream in *Christian Order*, albeit that His Eminence had a far wider audience when he described his dream of the future at the Synod in Rome last October. Like all dreams, mine is obviously conditioned by my conscious experience, by my belief that the New Order of Mass cannot endure for long as it stands; nor that vernacular "translations", which depart so far from the Latin text and are dreary, impoverished expressions of various tongues, can have a long life.

A Resacralised Liturgy

I dream that I go to bed one Saturday night in the near future and wake up on a Sunday morning, say in the year 2010. (I'd be 79 then, so I might make it, having far more confidence in medical progress than in the speculations of resless liturgists!) I rang my parish church to see if the Mass times had changed. No, they were the same; I was told that the 8.00 and 1900 hr. Masses were low Masses in the revised rite of 1986, the 9.30 a sung Mass in the same rite and the 11.00 a *Missa Cantata* in the immemorial Latin rite as last modified by Pope John XXIII. I was also advised that one would probably have to stand for the sung Masses unless one got there in good time. Out of curiosity I decided to go to the 9.30, despite my delight that the Mass

of the Ages was not merely still being celebrated, but was obviously meeting the needs of substantial numbers. I found a resacralised liturgy. Up to the Creed it was much as I remembered the Mass of Paul VI, without however any options or extempore remarks. From the Creed until the Communion the priest celebrated with his back to the people at an Altar, and the Canon, which seemed very like the Roman Canon of old, was silent. What a relief from inescapable noise and the priest's personality during these sacred minutes! Communion was received kneeling and on the tongue. After a brief act of thanksgiving, a final prayer and a blessing, an obviously edified congregation wended their way home. The choir had sung well. I remembered most of the hymns and chants, and there was nothing that remotely resembled the gruesome guitar-led "modern song" of 30 years ago.

Harmony in the Parish

As usual, some people chatted outside, and I met an old acquaintance who thought I had either been long dead or had moved from the district years ago. I heard that there were several lay groups active in the parish who had in effect taken over responsibility for most of the temporal works; finance, buildings, schools, transport and so on, freeing the priests for concentration on their spiritual work. Given true responsibility, the lay effort worked extremely well. Parish visiting by the priests was extensive and routine, especially trying to keep in touch with the lapsed, and the instruction of the many converts took up much time. There were very few frictions in the parish that my acquaintance knew of: the odd squabble about who did what at the parish fête was about the lot. I asked if there were tensions because of the choice of Mass forms? Good heavens, No, came the answer; there never were serious tensions among the laity. What tensions there had been were among the clergy, some of whom had adopted "positions" which made it a bit difficult for them when the Old Mass had been restored to liceity, but virtually everyone had been sympathetic and helpful at that time, and what troubles there had been were quickly and easily overcome. For a long time past, "regulars" at one Mass had

gone to another if it suited their plans without any sense of deprivation. On weekdays one low Immemorial Mass was always said, and it was normally the best attended.

Pre-Conciliar Days

My mind was racing as I went home. I tried to dredge back recollections of both the pre- and post-conciliar Church, trying also to discipline myself to look at both periods through clear-coloured glasses, for I vividly remembered how "progressivists" used to view the post-conciliar Church through rosy-tinted glasses and the preconciliar Church through glasses blacker than that in a welding mask with, needless to say, the "traditionalists" taking a diametrically opposite view. What had the preconciliar Church really been like? It certainly worked, for all its complexity, and had been pretty impressive. For all its reputation for stifling original thought, for dominating people's minds, it attracted converts of a calibre unknown after the Council: Newman, Knox, Chesterton, Greene, Waugh, Lunn, many priests and some bishops were names that went through my mind. The Church was certainly united, maybe a fact which attracted these distinguished converts, and its more humdrum members "knew where they were" wherever they went in the world. This seemed to me a fairly rosy-tinted picture, was there no black side? Yes there was. One would have needed to be somewhat blind, ignorant and prejudiced not to have been at least partially aware of quite extensive bigotry, intolerance, superstition, blindness, ignorance and prejudice. Some priests were very domineering, some bishops appeared to be very regal, remote and over-concerned with forms and legalities. This "view" of the clergy of those days may have been wrong or unfair, but so it seemed quite often at the time. A "thing" which had particularly cloyed for me in those days was the quite frequently met, exteriorised, publically visible show of what I called pietism. When one knew something about those involved, this outward show didn't seem to relate entirely to inner, private holiness. Also, while one always has to allow for the structuring of any organisation, the hand of authority, in its broadest sense, could appear fairly heavy in the pre-conciliar Church, and I remembered how much

I'd welcomed the calling of the Council, the prospect of letting some light and fresh air into long dark and dusty corridors.

Post-Conciliar Disillusion

I therefore started the post-conciliar years with fairly high hopes, or so I believed. I remember reminding myself of the need to try to be objective and honest, but I am absolutely clear in my memory of gradual disillusion creeping in as change was piled upon change without my ears, and those of many others, being able to hear the bells of change ring true. The "explanations" given at the time were fairly plausible, but the bells sounded cracked. I remember how remarkably little I knew at the start, how easily I had been dismissed with bromides when I started to ask tentative questions. But such dismissals likewise had not rung true: ignorant I certainly was, but I was not entirely stupid as well; I'd long ago realised that the Sacrament of Holy Orders does not raise the I.Q. of its recipient by 20 points. I remember starting to study, once I'd found out how to gain access to information about what had really happened. I remember the faith-testing discoveries made about the lies, the deliberate misrepresentations, the twistings, the intellectual arrogances and conceits, the taking of names in vain, the unsubstantiated assertions and presumptions, especially about the workings of the Holy Spirit. All the very human wiles usable by clever men determined to get their way were displayed at that time. The floodgates of memory were open—the incredible volubility of the period, with meeting following meeting at bewildering speed, discussing nearly everything under the sun, the enthusiasm for "open dialogue", provided of course that one did not ask any awkward questions. If one did, one was either told to close one's mind and obey, or was shrilly dismissed. I remember the lamentable disunity, within families, parishes, religious orders (especially the 'J's'), hierarchies (especially the Dutch). I remember the lapsations, the fog spread by some ecumaniacs, the weird combination of humourless earnestness and unctious grins met among enthusiasts for "ever-on-going" renewal. I remember the partiality of the Catholic media, a part of

the attempted brain-washing exercise based on the ludicrous belief that truth could be so suppressed. I remember the wilful, resolute refusal of many in authority to look dispassionately, and open-mindedly at the effects of "renewal" in their totality. I remember the patience of many of the laity who were established in the Faith; those who were living on the sense of loyalty they had inherited from the past and which was so sorely tried. I remember the catch-words and phrases which by no means meant what they implied. Troubled times indeed these have been, and yet, the pre-conciliar Church probably needed a shake up, and would have been hard put to avoid one in the climate of the times. What had gone wrong? Probably the juggernaut driven by the radical intellectuals had just run out of control.

Sorting Things Out

What had happened during my nearly 30 years of sleep to sort things out, to bring about an obvious revival? I'd have to find out. There was going to be a lot of study ahead if I was spared to do it. What was likely? It would have to be something along the lines of there having been a faithful reinterpretation of Vatican 2 in a manner which that body itself directed at the time (but which had been blatantly ignored), namely that it be interpreted in the light of Tradition and the previous Councils of the Church. It would be "interesting" to know the details. Had the heterodox submitted or gone off into heresy; which heads had rolled if any; which Peter had stopped the rot? Had the innate good sense of most of the laity once again turned the tide, and so on? But the important thing was that it had happened, that Christ's guarantee had been yet again seen to hold, that once again His Church could be readily known by her marks.

We can all dream, and maybe there's some truth behind dreams. But when not dreaming, I can only pray and hope that the Powers-that-Be will seek reconciliation within the flock, will be prepared to look backwards as well as forwards, to admit to mistakes and rectify them, rather than submit the faithful to further untested medicines, which are no doubt available in the pharmaceutical laboratories run by the devisors of our present chaotic mess.

Letter to my Parish Priest

R. S.

Dear Father Jellyby,

Some years ago, a meeting was called by our former parish priest. The idea was to find out how we felt towards the use of the vernacular in the Mass. The attendance was very poor, probably because the Catholic laity of those days hadn't the slightest idea where all this was leading. Neither did we know that it was positively our last appearance—we were never going to be asked again for our opinion on changes in the Liturgy.

Last Sunday, the 9.30 Mass (I cannot go at any other time), was preceded by a non-Catholic hymn. "Readings" followed, during which Father Yesman sat on a chair on the top step of the sanctuary, with his back to the tabernacle. At the Communion, a lady wearing some sort of robe, evidently designed for the occasion, came on to the sanctuary from the sacristy, and was handed a ciborium. After Communion, we were allowed, for the very first time since Mass began, a little silence. This lasted about three minutes, after which Father Yesman gave out some Notices (important ones, like promising refreshments for the forthcoming disco), which had been omitted, as is usual, from the newsletter.

Is it surprising that about thirty parishioners now drive a considerable distance to hear Mass in the "old rite"? I have heard them dismissed as "crackpots". This is foolish and unjust, and solves nothing. I know many of them: they are responsible people of good standing.

We hear a lot about "Adult Education", yet it is a fact that no priest dare make available to his people such Papal documents as *Mediator Dei* (Pope Pius XII), which forbids the use of a "table" facing the congregation instead of an altar; *Veterum Sapientiae* (Pope John XXIII), in which he lays down that the language used by the

Church must be "noble, majestic and *non-vernacular*" (my emphasis); *Immensae Caritatis* (Pope Paul VI), in which he gives the conditions under which Communion can be given by an "Extraordinary" Minister: (none of these conditions exist in this parish); neither can he produce a shred of authority from Rome for the "Presiding Priest" to sit with his back to the tabernacle, or for the introduction of Modern "Hymnals", such as "Songs from Bedlam", much favoured here at the Childrens' Mass and so on . . .

Don't get me wrong, Father: I know that in many instances we are faced with the fait accompli, and there is nothing you can now do about "Facing the people" and "Communion in the hand". But before it is too late, and our people sink into silent apathy, at least let them see that you realise they have had enough.

So *please*, remove that cross with the image of Christ the King robed and crowned (forbidden in *Mediator Dei*), and give us back our crucifix. Re-read *Memoriale Domini* and *Immense Caritatis* (Pope Paul VI's ruling on "Extraordinary Ministers"). If you can stand it, read through "Songs from Bedlam" with an open mind, and see if you do not agree that most are sheer drivel, many are heretical and some verging on blasphemy. Please arrange that the Celebrant at Mass should not shock us by sitting with his back to the tabernacle. Please resist "pressure" to remove the altar rails; those who wish to kneel should not be forced to stand—they may not be in the majority, but they are certainly in the right. I have often pondered a remark made to me by a Catholic gentleman, a retired journalist, who devoted his life to the service of the Church: "I just can't understand all this . . . either Our Lord is present in the Blessed Sacrament, or He is not". Please *encourage*, rather than *tolerate*, the use of Latin, having in mind the constant teaching of the Popes, and Pope John XXIII's *Veterum Sapientia*—why, for instance, is Benediction never in Latin? Why drop the *O Salutaris* and *Tantum Ergo* in favour of other hymns? Please do not teach First Communicants to receive Communion in the hand.

Your much-tried Parishioner,
R. S.

Children at Risk

JOANNA BOGLE

SOME people have been hoping that, if the modern trends in sex education were ignored, and discussion on abortion, venereal disease, divorce, or illegitimacy discouraged, then Britain's "permissive era" would pass over and life would be back to a pre-1960s stage of family stability. They have been living in cloud-cuckoo land. Over the past five years, while people have been more interested in economic problems than in moral ones, the values of the "permissive" lobby have quietly settled into the very fabric of the bureaucracy of the nation, and are going to prove hard to dislodge. It is no longer weird way-out teachers or trendy campaigners who are calling for contraceptives to be issued to teenagers or for explicit films and slide-shows in classrooms. It is the Health Education Council and the Schools Council, two major "Quangos", supported by Government funds and regarded as pillars of the Establishment.

A Significant Recommendation

During 1981 a significant recommendation was passed by the Schools Council, which is an advisory body appointed by the Department of Education and Science to discuss the question of the school curriculum. The recommendation was that sex education should be offered in every school. The Schools Council cannot actually make such education compulsory—the final decision rests with each individual local authority—but its advice, sent round with the backing of a body regarded as the mouthpiece of the D.E.S., is obviously going to carry considerable weight.

To back up its recommendations, a list of suitable materials has been prepared jointly by the Schools Council and the Health Education Council. The H.E.C. has already been in trouble with its sex education and contraceptive campaigns. One film, designed for use during commercial breaks in cinemas and aimed at teenagers, was so explicit as to merit an "X" certificate, which meant that it could not be shown to the young audience at which it was aimed.

It depicted a young couple engaging in sexual intercourse in the back of a car.

Brook Advisory Centres

The new list of sex education material is entitled "Relationships and Sexuality". It includes several brochures produced by the Brook Advisory Centres. The Brook is a national network of contraceptive clinics for teenagers. A poster advertising one of their London clinics sums up its message: "Young? Need advice or help on birth control, pregnancy, or an emotional problem? If so, why not come along to the Islington Brook Advisory Centre? Free birth control advice and supplies—including free sheaths". The pamphlets on the sex education list include *Safe Sex for Teenagers* and *Teenage Birth Control: the Case for the Condom*. The approach of the Brook is simple: they say that teenagers are already active sexually, and that all that can be done is to ensure that no pregnancies result. In fact, the last decade has shown that more and more promotion of contraception has the effect of ensuring *more* illegitimate pregnancies and more abortions, rather than of reducing the figures for these. Abortions to unmarried teenage girls resident in England and Wales are now at their highest point ever—almost 33,000 in 1979—and the trend is upwards. This is despite the fact that the Brook, supported by a generous government grant which is annually increased to keep pace with inflation, has been expanding its work steadily for several years and claiming that only this approach will reduce the number of teenage pregnancies. It is not only abortions which have increased; live births to unmarried teenagers have increased too. The figures have risen since 1977 and in 1979 were almost 24,000. It is not only absolute numbers that have risen; the proportion of unmarried teenagers having abortions has also risen.

Venereal disease is also at a dangerous level. New cases of primary and secondary syphilis among the 16-19 age-group increased by 38 per cent between 1970 and 1979, and new cases of gonorrhea for the same age group increased by 12 per cent.

Sex Education

The approach to sex education which has already been tried in many areas of Britain and is now to be promoted

nationally as a result of the Schools Council recommendation is one that has already been tried in Denmark and Sweden. Britain can usefully learn from their experience.

Sweden introduced compulsory sex education in all its schools in 1956. A study of illegitimate births published in 1975 revealed that after 1956 "the illegitimacy rate . . . which had been declining, subsequently rose for every age group except the older group, which did not receive the special sex education. Swedish births out of wedlock now amount to 31 per cent of all births, the highest proportion in Europe" (Dr. Jacqueline Kasun, commenting on *Illegitimacy*, a study by Shirley Hartley, 1975). The facts are all too tragically obvious from the statistics. By 1976, the illegitimacy rate in Sweden was 33 per cent of all live births even though half of all teenage pregnancies were aborted.

Sweden's sex education programme included explicit material, slides, tape cassettes, and films, together with the introduction of samples of contraceptive pills and devices into classrooms of boys and girls. There was minimal mention of marriage, much emphasis on "making sure you are safe", i.e. using a contraceptive at each sexual encounter. This is exactly the sort of approach which the literature advocated by the Sports Council and the Health Education Council offers.

In Denmark, where compulsory sex education began in 1970, there has been a 500 per cent increase in the national abortion rate and a 200 per cent increase in the illegitimate birth rate during the ensuing decade. Venereal disease in young people between the ages of 16 and 20 increased by 250 per cent and in children under 15 by 400 per cent.

The British sex education programme envisages not only education for heterosexual relationships but also for homosexual ones. The Campaign for Homosexual Equality has produced *Homosexuality—a Fact of Life*, which is on the Schools Council/H.E.C. list and is described as covering "all aspects of homosexuality such as terminology, causes, social attitudes, gay lifestyles". Other tastes will also be catered for. The book *Make it Happy*, which has already produced much comment in the press following widespread protests by parents, discusses bestiality and incest, and states that nothing should be considered wrong or "sick"

provided the aim was "to share enjoyment". It is on the list, recommended for school libraries.

What Can Parents Do?

What can parents do? They can—and, frankly, *must*, if they wish to protect their children—find out what plans, if any, exist for sex education in local schools. They must ask to see materials, and to talk to the teachers concerned. They must insist that the old Department of Health guidelines—never actually revoked—must be adhered to. These insisted that sex education be given in the context of "chastity before marriage and fidelity within it". They must lobby MPs, demanding that the Government withdraw its support from the Brook Advisory Centres—surely a sane thing to do, in any case, at a time of cutbacks in public expenditure—and that Brook material be removed from the Health Education Council list of approved literature. They must express concern through their local Education Committee and Community Health Council.

They must, above all, be well prepared and well armed. An excellent organisation working in this field is The Responsible Society, which marks its tenth anniversary this year. The Society has produced some useful material, including a helpful handbook, *Dear Parents and Teachers*, which warns of what is going on. A letter to the Secretary at Wickem, Milton Keynes, Bucks, would provide you with a friendly and helpful contact who can offer all sorts of practical advice and will welcome support for what is obviously an uphill and at times discouraging campaign. Ask, too, for the really good brochure for teenagers, produced by a team of young people, which offers good reasons for "saying no" in a lively and attractive style. The leaflet is the perfect antidote to the Government-funded propaganda with which today's hapless young are being presented. It says "Real freedom comes from being true to your own real beliefs. Saying 'no' isn't negative: 'no' to 'having sex' is saying 'yes' to a real caring relationship for the future. Sex is only really fulfilling when it's part of the total commitment of marriage. Sleeping around cheapens sex—don't be afraid to say you're saving it for its real purpose. The people you value will agree with you anyway, and it's friendship and love that really matter".

Patriotism : A Christian Virtue

ANTHONY COONEY

HIS Holiness, Pope Pius XII, in his "Summi Pontificatus" of 20th October, 1939, had this to say :

"It is well to insist here that this sense of universal brotherhood which Christian teaching awakens and keeps alive in our minds is not opposed to the love of a man's country and for the glorious memories it has for him. This same Christian teaching assures us that God has established an order of charity which binds us to love better and to cherish more those who are bound to us by special ties."

It was a theme to which Pius XII was to return constantly during his Pontificate. As at its beginning, so near its close, he spoke again of a true Nationalism : this time it was in an address to a gathering of poets (21st October, 1957). The Pope spoke to them of the close communications now existing between countries; but not to repeat the Conventional Wisdom of the Peace, Progress and Prosperity which must follow this, as Effect follows Cause; rather to warn of the danger that nations could weaken in their national traditions and renounce their native customs : "Any kind of cosmopolitanism which would cause the nations to renounce their national characteristics must be avoided". G. K. Chesterton had put the matter succinctly, many years before :

"The Patriot loves his country, but the Cosmopolitan cannot love the Cosmos".

Why should Pope Pius XII, a Pope who even in his own lifetime was recognized as one of the great Popes of history, return, as he so often did, to a theme which the world assures us is "old fashioned", "out of date", at variance with the *zeitgeist* of Internationalism and the New World Order ? It is, quite simply, because Patriotism, what theol-

ogy terms *pietas*, is a *natural virtue*. We are required by Natural Justice to love the land of our birth (*Summa Theol.* IIa IIae, q.C1.), but as Christians we are commanded to do so by the Commandment "Honour thy father and thy mother". Patriotism is but an extension of filial piety imposed upon us by the Commandments.

Before Christianity invented the Nations and sanctified Patriotism, pagans knew it as a natural virtue. No crime outranked that of treason for the Greeks. The corpse of the traitor was not permitted to pollute the sacred soil of the homeland, but was flung into the sea. No penalty was considered so severe as banishment. There is an inscription upon the tomb of a Greek, buried far from home: "Far from my own land I lie, and more bitter to me is that than death itself", and for Ulysses the very smoke of home was brighter than the flames of a foreign fire.

As with the pagans, so too with Christian saints. So Saint Columcille, as he left Ireland, said "There will be no night—I will not hide it—that a tear will not come into my eye". Saint Joan of Arc's piety on the question was quite simple; the English must be driven out of France, for only in England could they save their souls. If her piety was simple, the theology from which it arises is profound. To reject the duties of Patriotism is to reject, to a greater or lesser extent, the Will of God, for God has willed that one be born in one country rather than another, and he has therefore provided in our native land the means of perfection and salvation. That is why the Church in her prayer for emigrants used to say:

"Grant, O Lord, that we may welcome them once more to their native land".

To say, "The world is everyones'" is to say very little, for if board and hearth are public to all, we are left without a home and are born and live in an ale-house. The words of the Scot's Patriot, Fletcher of Saltoun, of whom it was said, "He would gladly die for his country, but would not do a base thing to save it" put the situation well: "Show me a bombast and a braggart, and I will show you a knave and a scoundrel, but show me a Patriot who loves his country, and I will show you a true lover of humanity. Show me a man who says that he loves all nations equally

with his own, and I will show you a man who lacks all discernment, and loves none but himself”.

It was possibly such people who “love all nations equally” and whose sentiment is really *ubi bene ibi patria*, whom Pope Pius XII had in mind when he spoke, in 1957, on the dangers of tourism, which he listed as “unhealthy nomadism”, and “wealthy vagabondism”. In contrast to the philosophy “Where my benefit is, there is my country”, let us consider the words of the Welsh Patriot, and convert to the Church, Saunders Lewis :

“Wales, my country, is a vineyard given into my care to pass on to my children and to my children’s children as an eternal inheritance”.

Naturally this love of our home-land, with which we are charged, will not be on high during all our waking lives, for there is a rhythm in affection as in everything else. Our love of our home-land has its focal points, and the Church in her centuries-old wisdom has provided for this with the piety of Patron Saints for each country. Recently, on the day of the Royal Wedding, we saw the natural and joyous expression of Patriotism that lies at the bottom of all true hearts, and which, in England generally, lacks opportunity of expression.

England’s Patron Saint is Saint George. The slow revival of interest in St. George’s Day has by now made it unnecessary to repeat the story of his life and martyrdom, which are as well authenticated as most other saints. Nor need we worry overmuch about dragon-slaying, unless we also choose to doubt the historicity of Aristotle, who, centuries after his death was accredited, like St. George, with the slaying of a dragon. Saint George is important for two things : as Exemplar, one who was steadfast and faithful, and, quite simply, as our Patron Saint, whose Feast Day therefore ought to be one of those focal points for the expression of our love of our country and fellowship with our countrymen. Would not any saint do as well then ? This is a difficult question to-day, when so much of our misunderstanding of the psychological importance of the symbol and the symbolic gesture has been lost, particularly to Catholics who once understood it better than anyone else. To say that the gesture or the symbol is unimportant

is not to understand what it does to the heart. Carlstadt understood it well when he imposed standing for communion and receiving the host in the hand on the congregation of the Castle Church at Wittenburg (*Here I Stand*—Bainton, R. H., Mentor Books, 1950, pp. 159-60). St. George as our Patron Saint is imbedded into our national culture, and could only be changed with great injury to that culture, for, to paraphrase Pope Pius XII, our native culture is the body of the nation, as our religion is its soul; our native culture is the sum total of things which make us different from other nations, *and which order the continuity of the nation through time, transcending the generations of men*. It is the proxy of the dead and the enfranchisement of the unborn. That culture can only remain alive through the nurturing of its external symbols and rituals. Every nation knows this, which is why National Days are festive days, and why an itch for change and novelty is resisted. Chesterton in *Orthodoxy* remarked that "if a man should love his native land, his native land would adorn itself for him, as a woman adorns herself when she is loved". Saint George's Day for Englishmen, and particularly English Catholics, ought to be such a Day of Adornment.

ON SEEING A PRIEST "PRESIDING" AT MASS

So they have carried out their masters'
instructions to the letter;
Luther himself could scarcely have done better:
Luther destroyed the Mass, but he at least,
Was never throned on high, like a "Presiding Priest".

S. G.

Given the secularist dream of a "New" Church in a "New" World of self-contained Christians, a great many unpleasanties within the Catholic Church today fit easily into place as logical and, indeed, inevitable expressions of the prevailing secularism which afflicts the Church at present and which is being thrust still further into it by a ruthless and determined progressive minority.

CURRENT COMMENT

Secularism and the Supernatural : 2

THE EDITOR

IN a previous article, published last month, I described the secularist idea, dear to the heart of not a few Catholic Progressives, as that of a "New" Church in a "New" World of self-contained Catholics, fully themselves because liberated from all restraints, other than those which were self-imposed.

Secularist Revolution Within the Church

It would be a world in which man would be the master, making his own law and his own truth, with God relegated to the point where He was no more than an emanation of man fulfilled. To quote Gregory Baum once again, "God is not the symbol of power over man, but rather a symbol of power in and through man, that is the symbol of the release of man's power and its orientation towards growth and maturity". Man, not God, is the master of his revolution, by implication, on-going. It must be. There is no other way where the secularist is concerned. Once this is grasped, what we may have regarded til now as so many disparate unpleasanties, fit easily into place as components, at centre or fringe, of what is in essence a secularist revo-

lution within the Church. Most of what follows in this article will be in illustration of this point. Thereby the pattern of secularism will be made clear: it will be seen for what it is—a relentless, co-ordinated thrust within the Church in aid of on-going revolution. In what follows I propose to take the salient points in this pattern one by one and examine them for what they are—so many actual and active expressions in aid of self-fulfilment which is, in the last analysis and whether actively adverted to by all or not, the Catholic progressive goal. As we do this, everything, I think, will fall into place.

Downgrading of Ecclesiastical Authority

To begin with, the downgrading of ecclesiastical authority, particularly papal, is essential to the revolution within the Church in aid of the self-completion of secularist, self-contained man. Precisely because man is seen (wrongly) by the secularist as self-contained—and must be so seen—fulfilment or completion can only be on his terms, which means without external restraint from within the Church, which means the downgrading of ecclesiastical and papal authority to the point where it is abolished or simply fades away into fretful futility. It cannot be stressed sufficiently that the pressure today against the Papacy is at its heaviest. The same applies to the episcopate; but so many of its members have proved so weak in the post-conciliar years that they no longer constitute much of a problem where the Progressive Establishment is concerned. They have bent so far before the progressive thrust, their weakness is so apparent, that many of them are now more of a hindrance than a help to the Holy Father. Their passivity in face of the prevailing permissiveness within the Church hobbles him in the magnificent effort he is making to stem the secularist tide. He is without the real support of so many of his bishops. Where the Holy Father is concerned, the episcopate appears, apart from a few magnificent exceptions, as something of a spent force. The Pope is alone.

The downgrading of ecclesiastical authority takes many forms. Present pleas for what is called democracy within the Church have this downgrading as their ultimate objective, with the Pope seen as little more than exercising an

overall presidency over national groupings within the Catholic Church, each one of which is doing its own thing in its own way and carrying responsibility for so doing. Clearly, the active participation of the Laity, excellent though this may well be in itself, is seen by the Progressive Establishment as in aid of the dilution of ecclesiastical authority at diocesan and parish level, with the Laity not merely assisting administratively but, eventually, in association with the clergy, making their own "truth" in aid of their secularist goal and to suit shifting circumstances after the manner, say, of a Synod of the Anglican Church. We had a foretaste of this at the Liverpool Pastoral Congress. Where the secularist mentality is concerned, there is no difficulty with regard to this kind of procedure. Neither should there be for, if man is self-contained and his goal, in consequence, self-completion on his terms (which is what secularism means), then he makes his own truth to suit that goal. The idea of an external authority imposing restraints on his progress to self-ordained perfection is alien to the autonomous Christian. For him, the only valid restraints are those which are self-imposed. Any other he regards as invalid because in restraint of his progress to self-ordained perfection, which carries its own morality in this way—that which helps him to progress is good; that which circumscribes or prevents him from so doing is bad. For the secularist *par excellence*, the end does, indeed, justify the means. Further reflection will show that calls for academic freedom (so-called) and rights of conscience (by which is meant private judgment) are in exactly the same direction. Secularist self-completion demands of its very essence that self-contained man do his own thing on his own terms and that he be allowed to do so. It follows that everything within the Church that prevents him from so doing must go.

Denial and Dismissal of the Supernatural

The denial or, simply, dismissal of the supernatural is endemic within the outlook of the contemporary Christian secularist. He sees it, as indeed he must, as alienating men, with talk of Heaven to come, from what he thinks of as their main task *in this life*, which is that of self-fulfilment

on this earth. The parallel here with aspects of the Marxist outlook is clear enough. Moreover, and in complementary fashion, organized or institutional religion at the service of the supernatural, with its imposition of "taboos" and its talk of divine punishment in the world to come, is regarded necessarily by the secularist as inhibiting the autonomous Christian's pursuit of self-fulfilment which, of its very nature, must be not only on and of this earth, but on the self-contained Christian's own terms and nobody else's. The whole process which takes the Christian secularist to his goal of self-fulfilment adds up to a new self-sufficient religion which necessarily contains within itself its own morality. Better, it is its own morality. By which one means, once again, that the "liberating" process within secularist man himself, like that which he and others bring to bear on society as a whole, is governed by one very simple moral criterion; that which assists it is good and that which inhibits it is bad. Man must break the chains within himself, if he is to break those that bind society as a whole. Similarly, he must break those that bind society if he is truly to free himself. In neither process can there be room for supernatural restraint. The self-containment of secularist man dedicated to self-completion forbids it. Here again, the parallel with Marxism is only too obvious.

This kind of "liberating" outlook stands very clearly revealed within the Church today in the field of sexual morality. The "new" criterion here is not in line with that which sees sex as a thing of beauty, God-given; essentially *a means* to love that is true and lasting. The "new" sexual morality within the "New" Church, in aid of self-fulfilment, sees sex no longer as a means, but simply as an end in itself; something whose morality is determined by the ability of those who employ it—in whatever way—to derive satisfaction, growth and, therefore, fulfilment from it. The criterion is no longer that it should fulfil God's purpose; but that it should help the user to discover himself or herself in the process of its use and achieve, in so doing, the "maturity" of Christian "growth". For those possessed of this false and basically selfish outlook—and there are not a few of them within the Church today—anything goes within the sexual field provided it is related

to what the Christian secularist (again, a contradiction in terms) thinks of as self-completion. In evidence, one might cite the following statement given out in June, 1978 by the Catholic Theological Society of America: "Any form of sexual behaviour, including both homosexuality and adultery, could be considered acceptable, so long as it is 'self-liberating, other-enriching, honest, faithful, socially responsible, life-serving and joyous' ". The pseudo-scientific jargon that runs through this statement does not conceal the basic filth contained within it. Where persons are concerned mutual love is here traded for mutual exploitation of the oldest kind in the world. We end up with no more than a new name for a very old slavery. The learned idiots who promoted and, presumably, continue to promote this kind of idiocy ought long since to have been put out from their teaching posts by resolute ecclesiastical authority. For what they have given us in their statement is no more than a guide to Gomorrha. It would appear that not a bishop in the United States has had the plain, simple guts to tear up this outrageous statement and throw it back in the faces of those who wrote it. At this I am not surprised.

Dismissal of Original Sin

Those who see the Church's primary task as that of assisting the self-completion of man are forced to disregard or dismiss altogether the doctrine of Original Sin. They have to do this because what the doctrine says so rightly is that man cannot achieve perfection on his own terms, in his own way, through his own efforts alone, unassisted by the Grace of God. The doctrine as it stands is, therefore, a repudiation of those Christian secularists (again, my apologies for the contradiction) who see the Church as concerned, necessarily and primarily, with promoting the self-completion of man. It follows that, where the Christian secularist is concerned, the doctrine has to go, for it is contrary to everything he believes in. He has proceeded, in consequence, to dismiss it; substituting in its place something he refers to as "the difficulties of the human condition". Or to hold up as true the cruder versions of the theory of evolution, which leave no room for Grace and, therefore, no room for man's fall from it; which means no

room for Original Sin. Anything but admit it. This is the method of the autonomous Christian and the admittance is increasingly widespread, no matter how outworn and suspect Darwinism has now become, both outside Church circles as well as within them.

Denial of Christ as Redeemer and as Divine

The denial of Christ as Redeemer of mankind flows logically and of necessity from the denial of Original Sin for, if there was no Original Sin in the first place, what was there to redeem men from? The answer would appear to be, Nothing. Where the "New Christians" are concerned it would appear that men have been struggling since the dawn of history with what they call "the difficulties of the human condition", which early Christians—after the manner of primitive people who sought supernatural explanations for all that they did not understand or found it convenient not to understand—were led to identify with the consequences of man's supposed rebellion against God. There being no such consequences for the autonomous Christian because there was no such sin, there was no supernatural deficiency — no gracelessness — for a Divine Redeemer to rescue men from. Denial of Christ's divinity flows logically from the denial of His claim to be Redeemer of mankind, once the denial of Original Sin renders the Redemption superfluous. What men needed then and still need now is scientific assistance rather than supernatural aid, the skills of the sociologist and psychologist rather than the ministrations of the priest. Great men, of course, have their place in society and Christ, indeed, may well have been a great man, one of a long line that has included characters like Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King after his coming; Socrates, no doubt, before. Great, indeed, Christ was, but not divine, because there was no need for Him to be divine. Man's problem was not due to the absence of Grace, its solution tied up with the restoration of the supernatural. His problem was and remains simply that of overcoming the difficulties that have beset him in the natural order on his way to secularist self-completion. These are manageable and will become more so as mankind continues its advance forward. Christ in His time and in

His own way made his own contribution to man's advance. For this, He is deservedly called great. The same applies to others before and after the time of Christ. So it goes. This is what not a few in the "New Church" would have us believe. It is nonsense and it will pass. We have had it before. Meanwhile, its effect is widely felt.

Catechetics

I think this downgrading not merely of original sin, but of personal sin (a concept alien to self-containment) and the divinity of Christ will be obvious enough to anyone who has the time and the patience to wade through the various courses of Religious Instruction, produced for the most part by the Progressive Establishment in book or roneoed-sheet form for use in schools. What you notice about them is an underlying stress, expressed in one form or another, on self-completion as a prime Christian objective under the title, say, of "Being a Person" or some such expression. This is coupled with what appears as the near-absence of any stress on the part Grace has to play in this process. The New Catechetics like the New Church is in aid of the self-completion of self-contained man whose God is immanent; man, himself, in other words, come to fulfilment; in no way transcendent. There is no room for personal sin in this outlook because there is no room for God against whom one sins. That is why the word has gone from the pages of contemporary Catechisms: "social" sin, yes; personal sin, no. Man is never at fault: this has to be sought in the social systems and structures that impede his progress to self-completion.

Against this background, Christian growth appears as a process of self-contained striving in the community of others and in aid of human fulfilment. One is left with the impression of the Church as concerned mainly with the comfortable living of self-contained man in a secularized world as a means to his self-completion; something to be sought primarily and of itself, and with the Church under obligation to be supportive of everything that takes and encourages men in this direction. The result is the diffusion of what is well called non-credal Christianity, a mix of permissixie humanism and on-going secularism, particularly

rife in the United States. James Hitchcock has explained its spreading pattern in a recent article in *Communio*. I quote :

"Even among Evangelicals, there is no aggressive anti-secularizing campaign currently being mounted in America, and most liberal religious leaders would be embarrassed and alarmed if one were to develop. This malaise is also found among Roman Catholics, though papal initiatives could well produce changes in the future. Rather than converting non-believers, liberal religious leaders see their principal task as that of converting their own people, a conversion process which involves learning to live comfortably in an unbelieving world : the most insistent point they make to their people is, 'Don't resist change'.

"On the face of it such a situation is fantastic—in most organizations the leadership is more firmly committed to the group's principles than is the membership at large and must often struggle to safeguard the fidelity of the members. It might be assumed, by one unfamiliar with the churches, that the laity would be particularly susceptible to secularizing tendencies, since they live immersed in the world, while the clergy, partially insulated in an ecclesiastical ghetto, would try to hold the line against erosion.

"The dream of liberal Christianity in each age has been that, if certain doctrines or practices are discarded, the remaining layers of faith will be secured against attack. Instead, in each generation, the attack penetrates deeper and still more is surrendered until, in the late 20th century, liberal Protestantism has scarcely any doctrine left. The secular world continually devises tests to determine how much the liberal churches will swallow, and by now it has become apparent that there is practically nothing they will not swallow.

"Seminaries and divinity schools are in more and more instances institutions whose primary effect is to produce graduates fully formed in the mentality of the prevailing secular intellectual milieu. This extends quite widely to include opinions about politics and sex, for example, but in particular it applies to the future clergyman's ingrained

attitudes of reserve, skepticism, even outright disbelief and antagonism towards the official teaching of his own denomination. Not uncommonly, pious young people from religiously conservative families find the seminary an experience designed to alienate them from their cultural roots, and many seminaries effectively bleach out most of the orthodoxy and fervour their students bring with them. Although formerly this was not true of Catholic seminaries, in the past decade it was increasingly the case as American Catholicism adopted more and more of the dominant attitudes of liberal Protestantism.

"Although the purpose of this kind of education is supposedly to make people 'open-minded' and respectful of diverse viewpoints, in practice it inculcates a mentality that is closed to anything outside the purview of existing secular orthodoxies. For many future clergy, and many seminary professors, it becomes imaginatively impossible to think in terms other than those that dominate in secular academic circles.

"Clergy, therefore, not uncommonly embark upon their work as missionaries, not however as missionaries to the unbelieving but as missionaries to their own flocks, agents of the general liberal consensus. Their primary task is understood as helping their people overcome their 'backward' and 'narrow' attitudes, many of which derive from the central traditions of the denominations to which they belong. Odd though it may seem the clergyman, by virtue of his education, is often a spiritual and psychological outsider in the denomination. Especially in the past decade, many clergy have left church work to become teachers, counselors, social workers, or bureaucrats in public and private social agencies, occupations unhampered by the necessity of maintaining even a residual religious identity".

I would suggest this says it all. I know nothing that describes in better fashion the deadly diffusion of secularism throughout the Catholic Church.

Liturgy

For the autonomous Christian, Liturgy is not the worship of a transcendental God outside himself, his Creator to

whom he owes all. His Liturgy cannot be this for there is little or no room for a transcendental God in his thinking. Where the autonomous Christian is concerned Liturgy can only be in aid of secularist man whose God is *immanent*; that is, man himself liberated into fulfilment. Liturgy, therefore, is for man or—if one may put it this way—for God only *through* man; man-centered, necessarily, if it is to be truly God-centered. In no way for the worship of God; essentially for the completion of man. Man-made, not God-ordered; subject, therefore, to change to meet the passing needs of man, tuning in with his varied moods. With the Mass, therefore, in no way essentially a Sacrifice, which presupposes Redemption and the worship of a transcendent God; rather, a shared happening in aid of fulfilment which, of its very nature, demands the “otherness” that community provides. Hence the accentuation today of the meal as the centre round which the community gathers; with the sacrifice set aside and all in aid of the meal, with table substituted for altar, genuflections cut to nothing, kneeling out and standing or sitting in its place; with the sacred species handled, passed round by all and sundry; with chat taking over increasingly in church; awe gone and reverence on the way out; a forced matiness pervading the whole and cafeteria-style communion increasingly the order of the day. Once God goes as transcendent, the rest follows inevitably. Man takes over. The whole centers on him. Inevitably, as secularism works its way into the Church, the new Liturgy is man-made; as such, always incomplete, frustrating, subject, in consequence, to cumulative change. The result can be no other, as the words of men replace the Word of God.

Ecumenism

Truth for the autonomous Christian, who sees himself as sovereign, is something tailored by himself to suit his needs; therefore relative, in no way absolute, something he can shift at will to match his own convenience; in other words, made by himself, in no way imposed on himself by higher authority, with the command that it be observed. Where sovereign man is concerned there can be no higher authority, for sovereign man is his own master. The ultimate

choice is always his. Where the secularist Christian is concerned, therefore, there is no absolute truth for the Church to guard; in consequence, no reason for the Church, especially in its institutional form, with its air of settled finality and implied repudiation of change. No reason, then, for conversion because no absolute truth to which to be converted and for the one, true Church to guard.

Out of this secularist background comes a type of bogus ecumenism, not unfamiliar today, which seeks not for conversion but convergence, employing ambiguities very often in the interests of a friendly and tolerant consensus round partial truth which is taken for ecumenism. The consensus itself very often is hinged to humanitarian causes as a means of holding it together. I would suggest this is a not unfair presentation—even though no more than a thumb-nail sketch—of the secular ecumenism of the World Council of Churches. For the Council, involvement is all; non-credal concern the solvent of its members many internal problems, with mankind loved, in the end, not on account of Christ, but in place of Him. As secularism makes its way into the Catholic Church this is the religion of a growing number of Catholics today. I remember a little girl, aged thirteen, in an American Catholic school, who was asked by a religious inspector who God was. God, she said, was other people. This brand of ecumenism is bogus; no more than one of several expressions of contemporary non-credal Christianity.

Missionary Effort

Finally, and very shortly, there is not merely no need, but no point in the missionary effort of the Church where the autonomous Christian, intent on self-fulfilment, is concerned. This is only logical. The secularist Catholic thinks of Grace as in no way necessary for the self-completion of man, which is to be accomplished by himself through his own efforts, with the assistance of the human community. What point is there, then, in bringing men the sacramental means of Grace, which are themselves defined as highly irrelevant where secularist self-fulfilment is concerned. What the people of the Third World need are not the Sacraments, but sociology. Scientific Method rather than prayer. Not

priests, but social workers. And this, indeed, is all, in these latter days, that too many priests have become—to the immense loss of those in the Third World they were ordained to serve. It is no coincidence that, in the wake of the Council, the missionary effort of the Church has lost much of its savor; for secularism came creeping in to the minds and hearts of too many priests and religious at that particular time. The savor will be regained when the Church itself, in the persons of its missionary priests and religious, lays a firm hand once again on God's truth, returns to the source from which it has always drawn its strength.

I have been conscious, whilst writing these lines of how easy it is to strain facts to the point of improbability in an endeavour to make them fit a theory. I have tried at all costs to avoid doing so here. I would suggest that the attempt has been at least partially successful. The facts given above have been forced to fit no theory. They flow logically enough and truly enough from the basic assumptions of contemporary secularism.

DEEPER FOLLY

The "wise" among the Chosen People said:
"Pull up your roots: we grow pot-bound;
Not thriving like the Nations all around".

The people listened, and they spread
Among the heathens: gradually shed
Their hoary and fanatical ideas,
Fossilised with the passing of the years:
Worshipped their neighbours' idols, and forgot
The terrible Commandment: "Thou shalt *not*".

Of the conversion of a single pagan soul
There is no word:

From our far deeper folly
Deliver us, O Lord.

R. S.

The Catholic Church in Britain, 1981

LAYWOMAN'S VIEW

NICOLE HALL

The Laity

A LARGE proportion of the ordinary laity are still quite unaware of the difference between liberal ideologies and the Catholic Magisterium, adapting themselves without question to whatever is available in the way of catechetics or liturgy.

Many of those who have heard the new ideas abandon religion altogether, others adopt these ideas without much thought, perhaps because for years they have not been reminded of what the Catholic Church *is* and of what she teaches. Also the beurocracy within the Church today provides prestigious employment for hundreds of Catholics who may well feel a lack of job satisfaction in their daily working lives.

A small element (increasing) of those who are aware of what is happening, are deeply concerned. When, after repeated fruitless attempts to obtain justice, let alone Catholicism, these people realise finally that their bishops are not prepared to act, many of them give up the fight in near despair seeking refuge in the nearest Tridentine Mass Centre in an attempt to save their souls and their sanity. So there is an increasing vacuum in the middle ground and polarisation continues.

Priests

Parish priests, apart from those few still attempting to straddle an impossible fence, are either on the liberal bandwagon themselves, or are being victimised by their fellow clergy who are. In the absence of episcopal support and leadership their major consideration in time becomes personal survival. This can be secured on a daily basis by

capitulation. Very often this leads to a sort of self-disgust which, if it does not lead in turn to mental breakdown, is so often assuaged by the analgaesic of alcohol. Those few good and holy priests who have the courage to stand firm in such a situation are the hope of the laity and the life and soul of the Church.

Bishops

Sadly some of the bishops would appear to have sympathy with current liberal thought; of the rest, the majority lack spiritual vigour. Where the Faith is strong the moral courage necessary to defend it can usually be found. However, for years, bishops, like all Catholics, have been exposed to a banal and spiritually impoverished liturgy, and relentless arguments over catechetics by pseudo-intellectuals whose trump card is the implication that, if you do not understand and promote these ideas, you are stupid. Though at the time of the Second Vatican Council there were bishops who perhaps retained some of the impulsive vigour of youth, the majority now are of an age, and living in an era, when they find the social pressure to resort to the easy expedient irresistible. Having some years ago relaxed their grip in a spirit of ecumenical detente, they find it harder now to know at what point and to what extent they should try to impose their authority, which in many cases is no longer respected or even acknowledged. Invariably their courage fails them because their Faith is weak. Bishops are further constrained by a particular concept of "collegiality" which many of them sought to promote. Some years ago a bishop was free to correct errors in his diocese on his own initiative, if necessary with recourse to Rome, without having to take into account the reaction of, or implication for, his fellow bishops. Today this is no longer possible whilst adhering strictly to the present understanding of collegiality. As a result, perhaps, the overriding concern of many bishops would appear to be not to step out of line. There is a detectable reluctance to pursue their mandate to preserve intact and incorrupt the deposit of Faith through fear of the reactions of their fellow bishops. The present structure is such that attitudes prevent action being taken.

The Liberal Establishment

This is often referred to as the "parallel magisterium" and has been gathering momentum and credibility since the time of the Second Vatican Council. Partly due to the problems at Corpus Christi College and its belated closure in the sixties, people holding strong liberal opinions—in particular ex-priests—have managed to attain key positions at advisory levels within the Church's structures, and also throughout the majority of her educational establishments ranging from primary schools to theological colleges and seminaries. Instructions from the Holy See are selectively suppressed within these institutions and replaced by heterodox literature written by the establishment. The media is also largely controlled by this body, and if an orthodox Catholic loyal to the Holy See attempts to print the truth he is quickly removed. From such influential positions there is a vigorous and sustained effort to win over the Catholic population to ideas which are intrinsically anti-Catholic because they challenge to the point of rejection the Magisterium, and the divine authority of the Catholic Church to teach. There is also an almost pathological hatred of all traditional Catholic piety, and a mental outlook is engendered in clerical circles which results in the simplest legitimate protests on the part of a recognisably orthodox Catholic being crushed with violent and often punitive zeal. The only acceptable contributions must be sufficiently vague to be meaningless and expressed in newspeak. Ecumenism as it is practised in this country has helped at all levels. The most important example is perhaps that on advisory commissions bishops are encouraged to pursue, for ecumenical reasons, an anglican type of episcopacy, presiding without interference over an ever increasing diversity of belief and practice. If there were no question of disloyalty to the Church's magisterium, this movement would condemn itself by the methods it uses to obtain its ends. This liberal establishment was responsible for the recent National Pastoral Congress, the organisation of which does not bear examination, and which ignored and suppressed the real problems; thereby exacerbating them. It is now engaged in organising the forthcoming visit of our Holy Father to this country.

It is beyond question that many young Catholics leave the Church — not because they reject its teachings, but because they know nothing about them. This indictment of contemporary Catechetics so ably presented in the article that follows is as true of this country as it is of the United States of which this author writes. Acknowledgements to the *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*.

Demythologized Catechetics

EDITH MYERS

SCIENTIFIC theories continually change. It was estimated some years ago that in the library of the Louvre, in Paris, there were at least three and a half miles of books on science which were obsolete and outdated, books that no one read any more.

At the time of Galileo in the early 17th century, a number of churchmen made a great mistake — one which should be a warning to those who follow them. Their mistake was not so much in distrusting Galileo, who did not at the time have conclusive support for the Copernican theory, but in aligning themselves—and trying to align the Church—with the popular scientific theory of the day. The popular theory of the time, the one accepted by the great majority of scientists, was the Ptolemaic theory. The churchmen reasoned that the majority could not be wrong, and therein lay their error.

There are still, unfortunately, churchmen who make the same error. The popular scientific theory of today, with regard to the origin of man and of all living things, is evolution; and since this has been true during all of the present century, it is a theory which is firmly entrenched in education. This is not to say that all scientists accept it. An increasing number do not, and an increasing num-

ber present cogent arguments against it. A few years ago, a paper against evolution was presented before the international congress of anthropologists; the Institute for Creation Research affirms that there are thousands of scientists who reject evolution. It has been termed by a French scientist, Jean Rostand, "a fairy tale for adults". But this does not alter the fact that it is the *popular* theory, and one which, despite the lack of convincing evidence, has been generally taught in all of the secular schools.

Teaching on Adam upheld

During the first half of this century, Catholic educators had the wisdom to maintain their independence and refused to subscribe to an unproven theory. In Catholic science classes, evolution was presented as precisely what it is: a hypothesis, and its weaknesses were frequently pointed out. But by 1950, following the example of so many of the churchmen in Galileo's time, some Catholics began to adopt the popular theory. This was one of the many trends—especially prominent in the writings of Teilhard — which brought forth the encyclical, *Humani Generis*. In this encyclical, Pope Pius XII set forth the rules that must be followed:

"... the teaching authority of the Church does not forbid that, in conformity with the present state of human sciences and sacred theology, research and discussions, on the part of men experienced in both fields, take place with regard to the doctrine of evolution, in as far as it inquires into the origin of the human body as coming from pre-existent and living matter — for the Catholic faith obliges us to hold that souls are immediately created by God. However, this must be done in such a way that the reasons for both opinions, that is, those favorable and those unfavorable to evolution, be weighed and judged with the necessary seriousness, moderation, and measure, and provided that all are prepared to submit to the judgment of the Church, to whom Christ has given the mission of interpreting authentically the Sacred Scriptures and of defending the dogmas of faith".

The Pontiff made it clear, however, that evolution should *not* be taught as though it were a proven fact. He continued:

"Some, however, rashly transgress this liberty of discussion, when they act as if the origin of the human body from pre-existing and living matter were already completely certain and proved by the facts which have been discovered up to now and by reasoning on those facts, and as if there were nothing in the sources of divine revelation which demands the greatest moderation and caution in this question".

And he completely ruled out the hypothesis of polygenism. The faithful, he said, cannot embrace the opinion that "after Adam there existed on this earth true men who did not take their origin through natural generation from him as from the first parent of all, or that Adam represents a certain number of first parents". Original sin, he affirmed, is "a sin actually committed by an individual Adam and which through generation is passed on to all and is in everyone as his own".

Some years later, the Council Fathers at Vatican II referred to original sin, and reaffirmed the belief that man was "made by God in a state of holiness". In an address to a symposium of theologians and scientists in July 1966, Pope Paul VI reviewed the teaching of the Church on original sin and stated that this doctrine,

"both regarding its existence and universality, its character as true sin even in the descendants of Adam and its sad consequences for soul and body, is a truth revealed by God It is therefore evident that the explanations of original sin given by some modern authors are irreconcilable with true Catholic doctrine. Starting from the undemonstrated premise of polygenism, they deny, more or less clearly, that that sin committed at the beginning of history, from which so many cesspools of evil have come to mankind was first of all the disobedience of Adam, the 'first man'".

Pope Paul upheld the teaching that each soul is immediately created by God, and that Adam's disobedience made him "lose the holiness and justice in which he was constituted". The Council, he said, did not aim at com-

pleting the doctrine of original sin: this had already been sufficiently declared and defined. It wanted only to confirm it.

Pope Paul repeated the official teaching in the *Credo of the People of God*:

"We believe that in Adam all have sinned, which means that the original offence committed by him caused human nature, common to all men, to fall to a state in which it bears the consequences of that offence, and which is not the state in which it was at first in our first parents, established as they were in holiness and justice".

Pope Paul had good reason to repeat and reaffirm this teaching, for it had been publicly and deliberately challenged by some of the scholars assembled at the aforementioned symposium. According to a report in *Newsweek*, August 22, 1966. Fr. Edouard Bonc, S.J., said that Adam and Eve held "no relevance" for him, and was upheld by Fr. Karl Rahner, who said the idea of polygenism was entirely feasible. The scholars wrote a report—said *Newsweek*—in which they agreed that "Adam and Eve" is a purely literary device to symbolize the first human beings; that man became man when he evolved from a lower state, and that original sin means merely man's revolt against his own conscience and *therefore* against God. "No reputable Catholic theologians today would argue", Fr. David Stanley, S.J., is quoted as saying, "that the earliest man was a preternaturally gifted human being who fell from grace through a sinful decision", and Brother Gabriel Moran, predictably, agreed. Fr. Robert Francoeur observed that having discarded Adam and Paradise, "we can properly locate the new Adam, Christ, in the paradise at the end of man's evolution".

Catholic publishers, the *Newsweek* article said, "are already adjusting educational materials to reflect a demythologized Genesis".

A new faith has been launched

Pope Paul VI, not intimidated by the confident assertions of the scholars, wrote the *Credo of the People of God* anyway, and insisted that the official teaching of the

Church be followed. But it is indeed evident that the authors of much educational material have shaped it to fit a "demythologized Genesis". A religion is being taught, via many programs, which is *grounded* in the evolution theory. Ideas which flow from this theory have replaced revelation. A new faith has been built on the shifting sands of scientific theory.

The assumption that evolution is proved, and that all life evolved in a random manner from a single form, requires the revision of many Catholic teachings. First of all, evolution envisions man as progressing constantly upward—a concept which clearly eliminates original sin. There were no first parents created by God in a state of holiness and justice; thus the first eleven chapters of Genesis, we are frequently told, are merely parable. Since evolution has no place for an immortal soul, all mention of a soul is omitted in the texts which reflect the new religion; and the impression is left—and in some cases plainly stated—that if there is a heaven, it is something man has to build on earth.

The new religion has caused consternation among many parents, pastors, and teachers, and perhaps among some of the bishops. Archbishop Bernardin of Cincinnati reminded his audience, in a talk given last year, that whatever the form of the first eleven chapters of Genesis, the Church obliges us to accept certain truths which are taught in these chapters. The fact that they are not history in the modern sense does not mean—as the Biblical Commission has said—that they contain no history at all. They do contain fundamental truths.

Unproven status—no problem?

Quoting Pope Pius XII's *Humani Generis*, the Archbishop went on to say that if belief in an original couple is not a defined matter of Catholic doctrine, "it appears to be included in the Catholic teaching about original sin and the Church's teaching on the basic unity of the human race. It is a teaching, therefore, which has to be taken seriously".

As for purely scientific problems the Archbishop said, the Church will wait for the scientists to solve them.

There are few scientists, if any, he added, who would say that the theory of evolution was absolutely proven.

The unproven status of the evolution theory, however, has not deterred the theologians and educators who have made up their minds to accept it and their assertions are extremely dogmatic. One finds them bluntly affirming, moreover, that Christian beliefs must be changed to fit the theory. Leslie Dewart declares in *Religion, Language and Truth* that "the evolution of man has brought about a change in the very nature of 'religious' belief" (p. 10). We are in a crisis, he says, which "has to do with the very foundations of Christian belief" (p. 17).

Monika Hellwig states, in *What are Theologians Saying?* that evolution forced the church to "reformulate" the dogma of creation.

The authors of *A New Catechism* (the Dutch Catechism) assures us: "One thing only stands out clearer and clearer, the marvelous fact that a species of animal living in plains and forests mounts a long line of evolution to reach—us". "The beast", they declare without hesitation, "developed into man" (p. 10).

This book is, of course, for adults; but children are assured while they are still of quite tender years, that evolution is true. By the time they reach high school, they have learned (as students did earlier in secular schools) to take evolution for granted. And this assumption is reinforced in innumerable texts—not science books, but in religion series.

We are "scientifically certain", write Kalt and Wilkins, prolific authors of religion texts, "that man's body evolved over thousands of years" (*The Religions of Man*, p. 23). The ancient authors of Genesis did not know this; and "the Adam and Eve story is a parable based on primitive scientific assumptions" (p. 48, footnote).

Ignorance of the faith abounds

In another book in the same series, the students learn that "Man is evolution become conscious of itself" (*The Mystery of Christ*, p. 52). In the course of the many books in this series—the "To Live Is Christ Series"—assurances concerning evolution are repeated. Such assertions are by

no means limited, however, to a single series. They are abundant in today's religion books, Fr. William J. O'Malley, S.J., writes in, *Meeting the Living God*, that an "unpromising ape" made a leap to human life—an assertion which might surprise even some of the evolution-minded scientists, who are somewhat less certain as to just how man emerged or from what.

Writers do not hesitate to revise religious beliefs to make them fit the theory. Original sin, say Brother Andrew Panzarella (*Growth in Christ*, p. 25), means "the situation we are in as human beings in an unfulfilled world".

Our view of God is also changed in the new religion. According to Gregory Baum, in a book for teachers in the "Discovery Series", God is no longer seen as the heavenly Father or the Supreme Being, but as "the transcendent mystery present in human history" (*Patterns of Situations*, p. 203).

Jesus, the authors say in the evolution-oriented Focus series, was "exactly as you are today" (*Focus on Growth*, Part 2, p. 96). But he had some "good ideas". "He brought God out of the distant heaven, out of the uncertain future of an afterlife, and put Him in men's hearts" (Part 2, p. 98).

"He [Jesus] knew that the kingdom of God is here on earth", the authors of *Focus on Faith* tell junior high school students. "We don't know exactly how long Jesus worked actively among people, attempting to convince them that the kingdom of God is here on earth" (Part 2, p. 99).

Fr. Joseph M. Petulla expalined in *Where Do We Go from Here?* that "what Jesus preached was an ideal human society", and it was "involvement in the affairs of his day that eventually led to his death" (p. 109). This is a book for parents, edited by Fr. William J. Reedy.

Says Brother Andrew Panzarella, F.S.C., in *Growth in Christ*: "What counted most in making Jesus a mature person was the fact that He gave His life a meaning. His life was filled with purpose. He felt it was His mission entrusted to Him by the Divine Father to give others a new outlook on life" (p. 10).

Since evolution-shaped theology envisions no world but this one, the meaning of salvation or redemption must be changed, and given a this-worldly meaning. In the book *Who Cares?* in Fr. Di Giacomo's "Conscience and Concern Series", we are told: "The whole message of Christianity is summed up in the act of redemption. Christ came to set men free. He came to take away our fear of Him and of one another. He came to take away the fear of death and punishment" (p. 20).

Who Cares? disposes of all traditional exegesis by saying that in the past, many holy people have "completely misinterpreted the New Testament, and yet you and I can interpret the book correctly with very little effort" (p. 30).

In *See You in Church*, same series, young people learn that redemption does not mean that Christ died in reparation for our sins; and that since we have changed our understanding of the sacrifice of the Cross, we can also change our understanding of the Mass (p. 35).

And indeed, understanding of the Mass has been changed in many religions series. In *The Developing Human Community* (To Live Is Christ Series), we find this interesting explanation of the Mass, in the light of our new understandings:

"When we Christians gather to celebrate the Lord's Supper we are celebrating our belief that we are history makers. The Mass is a dinner at which Revolutionaries gather in the presence of their Leader to celebrate what has been accomplished and to commit themselves to the completion of what has begun. (p. 75.)"

As we noted earlier, the Church obliges us to hold that souls are directly created by God. But in the new evolution-based religion, there is no soul; and belief in a soul is not taught in any of the books we have mentioned—or, for that matter, in many widely approved and recommended elementary school religion texts.

In *Mankind's Search for Meaning* (To Live Is Christ Series), the students learn that:

"Eschatology is the theology of the future, which Christians interpret as the better life to come because Christians have it within their Christ-given power to make a better life for mankind. (p. 106)"

As for heaven:

"Science has exploded the myth of some other part in the universe where one might go to find that other place called 'paradise'. (p. 26)"

[Jesus was clearly mistaken in his promise to the good thief.]

In *Challenge* (same series) the students learn that God expects us to bring this world to perfection (p. 203). And in *Achieving Social Justice* (same series), they are told that man can come to share in divine life in a "risen dimension of existence".

In *Meeting the Living God*, Fr. O'Malley is a little more hopeful as to an afterlife; he says he himself believes in one. But, he adds, "one's opinion of the afterlife is an act of faith—a calculated risk" (p. 130).

A *New Catechism* is more definite on this point. "Man returns to the earth like an autumn leaf or an animal . . . The whole earthly man does. Here the deniers of immortality are right" (p. 470). One lives on in the warmth and light he has spread.

If these things are true, there is little need for the Church. And indeed an excerpt in *Patterns of Situations* tells us briskly:

"Now if God's world is on the way to, or in the process of, its own perfection, it seems to me about time that we concentrated on the fact that Christianity is simply a service to help it become more perfect. (p. 141, quoting D. M. Keary)".

One might cite more textbooks used in Catholic schools which set forth a similar pattern of thinking. It is difficult to term it a theology.

Father Robert J. Fox, who deals constantly with young people, has written that 75 percent of today's young Catholics know nothing about their religion. It is beyond question that large numbers are leaving the Church—not because they reject its teachings but because they *know nothing about* its teachings. Older people are shocked and disillusioned by things they hear in adult education classes and conclude that the Church has changed what it believes.

The Eternal Sky

BURKE COSGROVE

FROM his window the priest could see the vast expanse of sky. Great billows of clouds moved slowly across it, so that the scene was never quite the same. Serenely and majestically the clouds formed a gigantic curtain above the earth. No matter what happened down below—wars, floods, fires, elections, assassinations—the heavens went on their course unperturbedly.

The priest was tired. It was now about noon of Sunday. He had preached at one Mass on Saturday evening and at the four morning Masses on Sunday. In between the Masses he had watched, from his window, the crowds coming into the church and leaving it. He had preached to about 1500 people but now it was all over and he was just musing by the window. It had been raining on and off, but now the sun shone on the green lawns around the church and the leaves glistened.

The church and grounds were deserted and there was now the solitude of nature. 1500 people, old and young, of every condition in life, had listened to his words and had returned to their homes or to whatever was now their pleasure. What difference had the Mass or his sermon meant to them? What a great mystery life was! Overhead the clouds pressed on relentlessly, the sun rose and fell, the green things bloomed and died. What mattered it in the scheme of things if no Masses had been said, no sermons had been preached and no one had come into the church? The world went on, despite all the actions and words of men.

The questions were eternal. Weren't they only, really, a demand upon God for some sign? A demand upon the hidden God to reveal Himself, to show His anger or pleasure? The same sun was now shining upon the newlyweds and those in the burning plain. The same clouds were now passing over the winning football player and the cancer patient. The same trees were giving their shade to the

golfer and the widow at the freshly-dug grave. Nature looked on all with indifference. What did anything matter?

It was no wonder, the priest thought to himself, that God had put such a premium on faith; faith so often heroically demanded. "Be ye faithful until death and I will give thee the crown of life". Faith in the hidden God, Creator and Sustainer of heaven and earth. Faith in the man called "Christ"—God ! Faith in the Virgin—Mother. Faith in a man called "Peter" and in his successors. Faith in what appeared as bread and wine. Faith in an immortal soul of a disintegrating body. Faith in eternal life beyond the grave.

A car stopped in front of the priest's window. A young couple got out. She was carrying a baby to be baptized. The child would be given the Faith and would then begin its journey to eternity. The priest murmured a blessing for the little bundle of flesh. "May you, little one, as you live out your life beneath the eternal sky, be faithful unto death and receive the crown of life. Amen. Amen."

HIRELINGS

The Shepherds are
A sorry lot.
—I am sorry for the Sheep—
Shepherds or Hirelings,
Timid of the Truth.
The Pastures are bare,
The Sheep half starved.
Promised greater liberty
Of wider Pastures,
Rank with poisonous weeds.
Where is the Athanasius
Who dare speak
For Christ and His Church?
Obsequious silence.
"Feed my Lambs feed my Sheep".

Fr. Joseph Brown

In the article that follows Michael Davies enunciates with his customary precision and clarity the perennial Catholic teaching with regard to true liberty as enshrined particularly in Leo XIII's great encyclical *Libertas Humana*, published in 1888 and whose totally valid principles are more pertinent today, perhaps, than ever before.

Pope Leo XIII on True Liberty

MICHAEL DAVIES

THE terms freedom and liberty will be considered synonymous for the purpose of this article. The Latin word *libertas* is expressed by either, depending upon the translator. The most important modern study of this subject is Pope Leo XIII's encyclical letter *Libertas Humana*. All that will be done here is to present a few of the more important teachings of this very profound encyclical in a popular manner.

Pope Leo XIII warns that there are certain so-called liberties which modern society takes for granted, that every man possesses as a right. These are the liberties "which the followers of Liberalism so eagerly advocate and proclaim". The essence of Liberalism is that the individual human being has the right to decide for himself the norms by which he will regulate his life. He has the right to be his own arbiter as to what is right and what is wrong; he is under no obligation to subject himself to any external authority. In the Liberal sense, liberty of conscience is the *right* of an individual to think and believe whatever he wants, even in religion and morality; to express his views publicly and persuade others to adopt them, using word of mouth, the public press or any other means. He has the right to choose any religion or to have no religion, and this

is a natural right. The only limitation to be placed upon him is that he should refrain from causing a breach of public order. Even the most extreme Liberal would hardly accept that someone who believed that men with blue eyes ought to be executed should be allowed to put this belief into practice by murdering them. Papal teaching distinguishes between public order and the common or public good. An obscene or blasphemous play might not provoke a riot, and hence would not disturb public order—but it could hardly be considered that permitting it would promote the public good.

Pope Leo XIII teaches that “many cling so obstinately to their own opinion in this matter as to imagine these modern liberties, cankered as they are, to be the greatest glory of our age, and the very basis of civil life, without which no perfect government can be conceived”. Sadly, it must be conceded that since Pope Leo wrote these words in 1888, the errors he condemned have become so generally accepted within the Liberal-dominated ethos of contemporary western society that they are considered acceptable, or even admirable, by most Catholics. It would be hard to find a bishop in the English-speaking world today who would give wholehearted endorsement to the teaching of *Libertas Humana*.

The Correct Use of Free Will

St. Thomas Aquinas explains :

God left man in the hand of his own counsel, not as though it were lawful for him to do whatever he will, but because, unlike irrational creatures, he is not compelled by natural necessity to do what he ought to do, but is left the free choice proceeding from his own counsel.

Similarly, Pope Leo taught that :

While other animate creatures follow their senses, seeking good and avoiding evil only by instinct, man has reason to guide him in each and every act of his life.

The Pope shows that liberty can only be exercised by those who have the gift of reason, i.e. angels and men. He defines reason as “the faculty of choosing means fitted for the end proposed; for he is master of his actions who can choose one thing out of many”.

He then explains that "freedom of choice is a property of the will, or rather it is identical with the will in so far as it has in its action the faculty of choice".

The will always chooses what it considers to be good or useful. The act of the will, the choice, is based upon a judgment made by the intellect, i.e. an act of reason. Judgment is "an act of reason, not of the will". We frequently lack the will power to implement what our judgment tells us is the right course of action.

Freedom is exercised legitimately only when man conforms his will to that of God. He has no natural right to prefer his own counsel to that of his Creator, even though physically and psychologically he is able to do so. A crucial distinction must be made here in discussing the nature of free will. This is the distinction between being physically and psychologically *able* (free) to choose evil, and having a *natural right* to choose evil. In the language of Liberalism, to say that a man is *free* to do something means that he has a right to do it, subject to the requirements of public order. "Nothing more foolish can be uttered or conceived", teaches Pope Leo, "than the notion that because man is free by nature, he is therefore exempt from law".

The Natural Law

The primary law to which every man has the duty to submit is the *eternal* or *natural law*, the law of nature implanted in our hearts by our Creator as part of human nature. This natural law, the Pope explains, "is written and engraved in the mind of every man; and this is nothing but our reason, commanding us to do right and forbidding sin . . . the law of nature is the same thing as the *eternal law*, implanted in rational creatures, and inclining them *to their right action and end*; and can be nothing else but the eternal reason of God, the Creator and Ruler of all the world".

What applies to the individual applies no less to civil society. Those invested with the power to govern in the states derive their authority not from the people who elected

them, in the case of a democracy, but from God. Legislators have no right to enact civil laws which conflict with the natural law, even if a majority of the people wishes them to do so. All authority in Church, state, and the family derives from God, as Our Lord pointed out to Pontius Pilate. Pope Leo condemns "the doctrine of the supremacy of the greater number, and that all right and all duty reside in the majority". Thus, the Church accepts democracy if, by this term, it is meant that those who govern are selected by a vote based on a limited or universal suffrage. The Church condemns democracy in the sense that those who govern do so not as delegates of God, but as delegates of the people who elected them; and that they are bound to legislate in accordance with the wishes of the majority. "It is not of itself wrong to prefer a democratic form of government", writes Pope Leo, "if only the Catholic doctrine be maintained as to the origin and exercise of power". Under no circumstances can any civil government have the right to permit such an abomination as abortion which is manifestly contrary to the eternal law of God. The Pope's teaching upon this point is very clear, and he adds that where a government enacts legislation contrary to the natural law we are bound *not* to obey it:

It is manifest that the eternal law of God is the sole standard and rule of human liberty, not only in each individual man, but also in the community and civil society which men constitute when united. Therefore, the true liberty of human society does not consist in every man doing what he please, for this would simply end in turmoil and confusion, and bring on the overthrow of the state; but rather in this, that through the injunctions of the civil law all may more easily conform to the prescriptions of the eternal law . . . the binding force of the human laws is in this, that they are to be regarded as applicants of the eternal law, and incapable of sanctioning anything which is not contained in the eternal law, as in the principle of all law . . . where a law is enacted contrary to reason, or to the eternal law, or to some ordinance of God, obedience is unlawful, lest while obeying man we become disobedient to God.

The Will Can Err

The faculties of reason and will are not perfect.⁽¹⁾ Pope Leo notes that "it is possible, as is often seen, that the reason should propose something which is not really good, but which has the appearance of good, and that the will should choose accordingly". This is a most important distinction. Man can err, culpably or inculpably. When the reason errs, and leads the will with it into an erroneous choice, what it has chosen is simply a mirage, the appearance of a good. The choice of error is a proof of the existence of free will, but not a valid exercise of the faculty. It is a corruption or an abuse. Pope Leo writes :

The pursuit of what has a false appearance of good, though a proof of our freedom, just as a disease is a proof of our vitality, implies defect in human liberty . . . it abuses its freedom of choice and corrupts its very essence.

A man who chooses what is objectively evil is not making himself free but the slave of sin (John 8 : 34). The ultimate consequence of a culpable choice of evil can be eternal damnation. Pope Leo warns :

The manner in which such dignity is exercised is of the greatest moment, inasmuch as on the use that is made of liberty the highest good and greatest evil alike depend. Man, indeed, is free to obey his reason, to seek moral good and to strive unswervingly after his last end. Yet he is free also to turn aside to all other things; and in pursuing the empty semblance of good, to disturb rightful

1) Wherever a choice is involved, the intellect or reason makes a judgment based on the information available to it, and the will then chooses whether or not to act upon this judgment. This is the case with any choice, whether or not a moral dimension is involved. Thus a veterinary surgeon could advise the owner of a dog that the animal was suffering from an illness which caused it considerable discomfort, and that the animal should be destroyed. The owner's judgment might well concur with that of the vet., but the choice made by his will might be to ignore the vet's advice as he could not bear to be parted from his pet. In this case the will is failing to act properly upon a sound judgment of the reason.

Often the will acts upon what it believes to be a correct judgment of the reason, but the act or reason leads the will into error as it is based upon incorrect, insufficient, or erroneously interpreted information, e.g., many sincere Protestants reject the Catholic Church because they honestly believe Her teaching to be contrary to the Gospel.

In the first example given the will was at fault, in the second the intellect or reason was responsible for leading the will into a wrong choice.

order and fall headlong into the destruction which he has voluntarily chosen.

Man is obliged to do all in his power to exercise the faculty of reason correctly, to exercise his judgment in accordance with right reason, bearing in mind that in moral and religious matters his decisions must affect his last end. Pope Leo explains :

The reason prescribes to the will what it should seek after or shun, in order to the eventual attainment of man's last end, for the sake of which all his actions ought to be performed. This ordination of *reason* is called law. In man's free will, therefore, or in the moral necessity of our voluntary acts being in accordance with reason, lies the very root of the necessity of law.

True Freedom is Obedience to God's Law

When a man exercises his liberty in accordance with the law of God he renders his Creator homage which is due to Him in strict justice and also follows the only path by which he can be saved. He does not abdicate his dignity, he asserts it. When he chooses evil he abuses and profanes his most sacred possession. Psalm 118, the *Beati immaculati*, provides an inspired commentary on the correct exercise of human freedom :

Set before me for a law the way of
Thy justifications, O Lord :

And I will always seek after it.
Give me understanding, and I will
search Thy law :

And I will keep it with my whole
heart.

The Need for Grace

Needless to say, the unaided human reason could never ensure that salvation was ensured. To maintain this is to fall into the heresy of Pelagianism. It is with the aid of God's grace that the individual is enabled to exercise his freedom in accordance with the law of God and thus attain salvation. The effects of original sin rule out the possibility of the unaided human reason leading men to salvation

without the aid of grace. In his allocution *Singulari Quadam* (1854) Pope Pius IX warned that :

Such clients, or rather devotees, of human reason, who set it up as their unerring teaching and promise themselves every success under its guidance, have surely forgotten what a deep and severe wound was inflicted on human nature through the sin of our first parents; for darkness has clouded the mind and the will has been made prone to evil . . . Since it is certain that the light of reason has been dimmed and that the human race has fallen miserably from its former state of justice and innocence because of original sin, which is communicated to all the descendants of Adam, can anyone think that reason by itself is sufficient for the attainment of truth ? If one is to avoid slipping and falling in the midst of such dangers and in the face of such weakness, dare he deny that divine religion and heavenly grace are necessary for salvation.

Pope Leo stresses the role of grace as the most important aid for the correct use of the reason and the will.

The first and most excellent of these is the power of His divine *grace*, whereby the mind can be enlightened and the will wholesomely invigorated and moved to the constant pursuit of moral good, so that the use of our inborn liberty becomes at once less difficult and less dangerous.

Freedom from Coercion

In order to promote freedom of conscience in its correct sense, Pope Leo teaches that the state should *not* ensure that "every one may, as he chooses, worship God or not" but that :

. . . every man in the state may follow the will of God and, from a consciousness of duty and free from every obstacle, obey His commands. This indeed, is true liberty, a liberty worthy of the sons of God, which nobly maintains the dignity of man, and is stronger than all violence or wrong—a liberty which the Church has always maintained and held most dear.

Freedom of conscience is not, then, a natural right if it is taken as meaning that man has a right to choose error.

But although an individual has no natural right to choose error he does possess a right not to be coerced into choosing truth in the internal forum of his private life. Pope Leo XIII taught in his encyclical *Immortale Dei* :

The Church is wont to take earnest heed that no one shall be forced to embrace the Catholic faith against his will, for, as St. Augustine wisely reminds us, "Man cannot believe otherwise than of his own free will".

The application of this principle in practice is best shown by the tolerance and protection extended by the Popes to the Jews.⁽²⁾ It must be admitted frankly that during the history of the Church this principle has sometimes been violated, but where attempts to force individuals to accept the Catholic faith have occurred it has been a violation of the true Catholic teaching.

But in a Catholic state the government has the right to *prevent* the propagation of heresy in the external form in public life. A distinction must be made between coercing a man into professing the truth, and preventing him from undermining the common good by spreading error in public and undermining the faith of the Catholic citizens. Thus in Catholic states such as Spain or Malta, before Vatican II, while sects such as Jehovah's Witnesses were left free to practice their religion in private, they were prevented by law from going from door to door in an attempt to persuade Catholics to abandon the true religion. Pope Leo explains :

Justice therefore forbids, and reason itself forbids, the state to be godless; or to adopt a line of action which would end in godlessness—namely, to treat the various religions (as they call them) alike, and to bestow upon them promiscuously equal rights and privileges. Since, then, the profession of religion is necessary in the state, that religion must be professed which alone is true, and which can be recognized without difficulty, especially in Catholic states, because the marks of truth are, as it were, engraven upon it.

The consensus of papal teaching for the last three centuries is that a Catholic state has the right to restrict the

(2) This can be studied in the article "Toleration" in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*.

external expression of heresy. But the Popes also teach that a Catholic state is not obliged to invoke this right. The common good might often be harmed more by attempting to repress public heresy than by allowing it. Where the repression of public heresy would harm the common good by, for example, causing widespread civil unrest (which happened when Protestantism was suppressed in France), then toleration is the better policy. Pope Leo writes :

For this reason, while not conceding any right to anything save what is true and honest, she (the Church) does not forbid public authority to tolerate what is at variance with truth and justice for the sake of avoiding some greater evil, or of obtaining or preserving some greater good.

According to Vatican II, everyone has the right to express his religious opinion in public as long as it does not cause a breach of public order. It seems impossible to reconcile this teaching with that of the Popes from the preceding three hundred years, because what a human being professes as a *right* cannot be the object of *toleration*. The Popes did not teach that what Jews and heretics believed, and the manner in which they worshipped, in private could be tolerated. They accepted that in the internal forum freedom from coercion is a *right*. But in the external forum, the public expression of heresy within a predominantly Catholic state could only be the object of toleration. It could not, therefore, be a *right*.

Pope Leo XIII himself summed up the teaching of his profound encyclical, *Libertas Humana* :

And now to reduce for clearness' sake to its principal heads all that has been set forth with its immediate conclusions, the summing up is this briefly: that man, by a necessity of his nature, is wholly subject to the most faithful and ever-enduring power of God; and that as a consequence any liberty except that which consists in submission to God and in subjection to His will, is unintelligible. To deny the existence of this authority in God, or to refuse to submit to it, means to act not as a free man, but as one who treasonably abuses his liberty; and in such a disposition of mind the chief and deadly vice of Liberalism *essentially* exists.

The Human Predicament

LAYWOMAN'S VIEW

MARY A. LYNCH

BERNARD LEVIN, interviewing Dr. Krishnamurtri on television, assumed that the Indian enjoyed some enlightenment not attained by most of us, which afforded an understanding of the "human predicament" and a manner of responding to it. Mr. Levin's questions were directed to discovering how such insight could be shared by all. Dr. Krishnamurtri himself seemed not to be aware of having esoteric knowledge. The personal philosophy he described was the traditional prudence of the dignified man who is free from greed and guile, free from aggression and cowardice. Viewers would readily agree that those fortunate enough to have been born intelligent and reared gently would be able to embrace his philosophy in principle, and even in practice. Yet when one asks how the dull, the deprived, the primitive and the violent could benefit from it one reacts by saying, "That philosophy is an ideal, practical for only a small minority". Yet no one can be satisfied with such pessimism. Some compelling respect for the whole human race prompts us to seek a salvation available to all. By contrast the Christian saints of history have brought individual and social happiness to whole communities by offering them something concrete and effective. They have established people in a personal relationship with God.

Adopted Sons and Daughters

Our natural powers and gifts are totally inadequate to unite us to God. The New Testament offers us over and above our natural endowment a divine life, status and destiny. God has made us creatures—noble masterpieces—

but creatures none the less, who can hardly be said to exist in comparison with the eternal "I am", having our being continuously renewed in time, not by our own will. (The existence I had five minutes ago no longer is; the existence I shall have in five minutes' time is not, as yet.) God's invitation is to accept divine vitality, created in us, making us no longer creatures only, but adopted sons and daughters.

To all who received him, who believed in his name, he gave power to become children of God, who were born . . . not of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. John I 11-13.

Unless one is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. John III 5-6.

God sent his Son . . . so that we might receive adoption as sons. And because you are sons God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying "Abba ! Father !" Gal. IV 5-6.

Your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ who is our life appears, then you also will appear with him in glory. Coll. III 3.

Is this transformation optional ? Rejection is a possibility for persons of free will, but acceptance is an obligation. No privilege more astounding could possibly be thought of —God's perfect intimate love, as if for an equal, offered to mere phantoms of being who without it would be rebels doomed to final defeat. So we are not at liberty to reply, "No, thank you. I'm not interested. Natural life is good enough for me".

That is what all or most of us would like to say because we are basically unable to grasp our supernatural destiny, and being even more disabled as a result of original sin, we are inclined to resist supernatural life.

He who does not believe is condemned already. John III 18.

He who rejects me and does not receive my sayings has a judge and the word I have spoken will be his judge on the last day. John XII 48.

The Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it neither sees him nor knows him. John XIV 17.

Supernatural Life

In healing souls or original sin God does not merely restore them to a state of healthy nature, because from the beginning the human family had a divine destiny. God intended to have the human race "above itself" living a life which with its natural genius and virtue it could not even desire, let alone live. Our first parents were created in a state of grace. To insult the love they had enjoyed by churlishly rejecting it did worse than relegate them to the natural level; the insult vitiated human nature itself. Recovery meant not a simple return to natural health. No natural health remained for them to return to. Hence the 'human predicament' is that the only way of restoring nature is by re-establishing it in the supernatural life that God intended from the beginning. God calls the human race to supernatural religion. That is the clear meaning of the New Testament. Supernatural religion is mediated to us by one person only : God the Son incarnate.

There is one name given to us by which we may be saved.

Christ and Culture

That is to say, there is and can be only one supernatural religion — Christianity. Natural religions have always abounded. Through them human being express their longing to worship what is greater than themselves and obtain its protection. However respectfully we regard these sincere prayers and aspirations we must necessarily hold them to be human inventions and at best adumbrations of Christianity. In their purer forms are truths and virtues that can be completed and fulfilled only in Christianity. This explains the Christian's duty to be a missionary. He cannot be contented to enjoy divine grace himself while supposing that the achievements of fallen human nature are good enough for others. If necessary he must give his life to make his privilege available to all. It is untrue to say that conversion to Christianity is an attack on the culture of a non-Christian nation. Christ is for everyone, as is a share in his sonship. All forms of culture are purified and enhanced by membership of Christ, and Christianity acquires a fresh beauty whenever a new nation adheres to it.

Rebirth by Baptism

The rebirth by which creatures become sons and daughters is the sacrament of baptism, a radical transformation which expunges guilt both racial and personal, and confers the right to possess and be possessed by God. Baptism is an initiation and requires to be completed by nourishment and education. For these purposes Christ founded his Church. He spoke of it, and his earliest disciples knew it, as a concrete, tangible and organised body to which people either adhered or refused to adhere. The New Testament does not represent Christians as joined by invisible, purely spiritual loyalties. It is therefore untrue to life when anyone speaks deprecatingly of 'institutionalising' spirituality. Christianity was founded as an institution and people obtain grace in and through it.

Jesus Christ promised "On this rock I will build my church", not "my churches". True, within the lifetime of the youngest apostle local communities were referred to as "churches", but the word meant about the same as "dioceses", not at all the same as modern "denominations". On the contrary, conservation of the same faith by all was insisted on by St. Paul :

Even if we, or an angel from Heaven should preach to you a gospel contrary to that which we preached to you, let him be accursed. Gal. I 8.

and by St. John :

If anyone come to you and does not bring this doctrine do not receive him. II John 10.

St. Peter had been designated the ultimate authority by Christ himself, and his responsibility for resolving doubts was manifest at the Council of Jerusalem, where his decision was accepted even by the dissidents and published in the staggering *ex cathedra* :

It has seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us
Acts XV 28.

The fact that Christ established an ultimate authority to preserve the unity of his church is clearly recorded in the New Testament. He gave no one permission to withdraw from that authority or to divide Christians by setting up rival bodies. The present divisions among those who acknowledge Christ have arisen because large numbers of Catholics claimed the right to do so. 'We were obliged to

secede from the Roman Church because it grew corrupt.' Christ well knew that his followers would grow corrupt :

Many will fall away and betray one another . . .

And because wickedness is multiplied, most men's love will grow cold. Matt. XXIV 10-12.

Woe to the world because of scandals ! Matt. XVIII 7.

Salt and Savour

The salt lost its savour, but the period before Martin Luther produced heroic spirits who strove, in an age tormented by poverty, disease and endemic war to halt their fellow-Catholics' headlong rush to spiritual destruction : Saint Vincent Ferrer, whose influence on sacred learning and church government was equalled only by his wide-ranging relief of suffering; Saint Catherine of Siena, who restored the Roman Papacy in the fourteenth century; Saint Colette, the Franciscan nun and reformer of the fifteenth century. Their gigantic work was achieved in an age when travel was on foot or by donkey, and the only means of communication were the human voice and handwriting. Theirs are the names that should head chapters in history books, yet all except specialists have forgotten them.

Truth and its Abuse

Their work was constructive. By contrast the first Protestants began a movement of the kind now colloquially known as 'throwing out the baby with the bath water'. Truth was rejected because Catholics were abusing it, and Luther's attack met with the instant popular acclaim that usually greets an over-simplification. Clerical education being so poor before the Council of Trent, no one was found to deal promptly with the inconsequent conclusions that appealed so strongly to the disaffected :

Priests have collected money in return for indulgences—playing on people's fears for their dead relatives; *therefore* there is no state of purification after death.

Priests have become wealthy by taking payment for offering Mass; *therefore* there is no re-presentation of Christ's sacrifice on our altars.

I, Martin Luther, cannot believe that my sins are forgiven *therefore* sins are never forgiven, only 'covered

over' by Christ's justice which is 'imputed' to those who believe.

Faith in Christ is necessary for salvation; *therefore* faith in Christ is sufficient for salvation.

Scripture is the word of God; *therefore* Scripture is the only word of God.

The institution of certain sacraments is not fully described in Scripture; *therefore* they are not true sacraments.

The religious revolution of the sixteenth century has given rise to a painful anomaly : Christians who have a right to the name because baptism has given them the supernatural status of adopted children, sharers in the divine nature, but divided from the centre of unity and without the protection of the supernaturally sanctioned authority.

True Unity

True ecumenism is based on the article of the Creed : we acknowledge one baptism. It recognises the supernatural status of all baptised persons, but it does not confuse people by pretending that all versions of Christianity are equally true, or that their differences are unimportant. Ecumenism takes a wrong turning when it regards the Catholic — Universal — Church as a sect and imagines unity as a future condition to be achieved by a kind of ecclesiastical diplomacy. The Church must not imitate the methods of secular statesmen who 'find a formula', an ambiguous agreement which all parties to a dispute are invited to sign without all meaning the same thing by it. The method of mutually trading concessions may be necessary and acceptable in temporal conflicts, but it is not the way to treat divine truth. We should be hoping and praying not for a unity contrived by ourselves, which would be a mere aggregate, unlikely to be permanent, we should be looking for the living unity which Christ established by sending the Holy Spirit, the Lord, the giver of life.

Unity is the salient feature of a living thing. Divide it and you will kill it. Divide some minor part from the main organism and that part dies :

If a man does not abide in me, he is cast forth as a branch and withers. John XV 6.

This illustration, used by Christ himself, assures us that *the Church* never has been divided and never can be, even though Christians divide themselves from it. To separate oneself from the authority which Christ established is to separate oneself from Christ, when one does so knowingly. Therefore the only way to unity is to accept that the one Church founded by Christ still lives, as he promised that it always would, identify it and join it at the cost of any sacrifice, for there is, and can only be one complete and authentic Christianity—the Catholic Faith.

Sacrifice there is sure to be, because the human predicament is that of impaired human nature, needing, but shrinking from, supernatural salvation. That is why the word *supernatural* is the key to religious and moral problems.

Narrow Gate: Hardy Way

Why does the Papacy forbid practices relating to sex which to non-Catholics are acceptable? 'From the beginning it was not so'. Sexuality was created for Christian marriage and that is part of the supernatural life, so any behaviour which takes account only of temporal satisfaction is inconsistent with its true nature.

Why does the Papacy forbid terrorism as a means of realising political aims? Citizens, especially those who claim the name Catholic, have no right to outrage the supernatural kinship they have with others for a temporal ideal, however precious. Here we have no abiding city.

Why should the investor not always pursue maximum profit as economic 'laws' suppose that he must? Twentieth-century experience of violent oscillations between boom and slump, together with worldwide failure to achieve prosperity, suggest that true welfare may be found in the beatitude: 'blessed are the poor in spirit' and the promise: 'Seek first the Kingdom of God and all these things shall be added'.

If the Faith is so necessary, so consistent and so often demonstrated in saintly lives, why does not everyone embrace it readily? The answer is given on the Sermon on the Mount:

The gate is narrow and the way is hard that leads to life and those who find it are few. Matt. VII 14.

When we are young the narrow gate and the steep, stony path seem quite impossible. As strength declines and the pleasanter walks we have chosen fail to keep their promise, we reach a time when it is clear that life on earth will soon end. "O God !" exclaimed Thomas Hardy when he realised it, "Death is such a waste of me". A contrast to the dying words of Jesus Christ, "I have finished the work you gave me to do . . . It is consummated". His is the only faith that makes death the climax of achievement, the only faith that promises redemption for the body as well as the soul.

From a Lancashire Catholic reader of *Christian Order* in a letter received more than a year ago :

"The December (1980) *Christian Order* prompted me to ask a good practising "ordinary" Catholic, 'What do you think of *The Easter People*'? The lady hesitated a little and then asked in return: 'Is that some sort of new American Group'?

"A further effort along these personal survey lines :

Scene : Large, well-known bookshop.

Customer : 'Have you got a copy of *The Easter People*, please'?

Sales Person : 'Who's it by, love? Is it fact or fiction'?

Customer departs - speechless, a wistful smile on his face.

Book Reviews

IRISH LIVES

Oliver Plunkett by Tomas O'Fiaich and Desmond Forristal, pp. 260; *Our Sunday Visitor*, Huntington, Indiana (\$3.95).

They Brought the Good News (Modern Irish Missionaries) by Marian Keany; pp. 146; Veritas Publications, 1980 (n.p.).

Undaunted Spirit (The Life and Times of Joseph T. Reilly) by Lucille Quinlan; pp. 314; The Polding Press, Melbourne (n.p.).

There are in fact two separate accounts of Saint Oliver Plunkett in the first of those books. Part One is subtitled "Ireland's New Saint" and Part Two "In His Own Words"—drawn, that is, from the saint's letters. But those letters were available to the writer of the first part and he quotes extensively from them.

Of the two, Desmond Forristal's contribution is much the better written, and his is the better presentation of the historical background to the saint's episcopal ministry and eventual martyrdom. Part One, for example, simply speaks of "the assertions of Titus Oates" (p. 74); one has to read on to page 209 to learn who Titus Oates was and about his concoction of the Popish Plot. It cannot be assumed that the reader will know about all this.

It was in this Plot that Oliver eventually became involved. He was set up as the prime mover of the Plot in Ireland, but he would never have been convicted in an Irish court. So the English had his case illegally transferred to London, where the saint was kept in chains in the filth of Newgate prison during the severe winter of 1680-81. After this experience (movingly described by Mr. Forristal) his execution at Tyburn must have been almost what we call a happy release. Happily indeed, it marked the end of the Popish Plot and of martyrdoms for the Faith in England. Incidentally, the site of Tyburn is not Hyde Park corner (p. 104) but at the north-east of the Park near where Marble Arch now stands.

The book does not seek to mask the saint's human weaknesses, which only serve to highlight the triumph of grace.

This cannot be said of *They Brought the Good News* : its eight subjects do not seem to have had any such weaknesses. At least it is only their undoubted heroism which is related, so that they appear ready for instant canonization !

If it be objected that there was no space in the compass of a small book to relate much beyond the heroic deeds of these men and women, the answer is that plenty of space could have been made by the omission of a number of the photos with which the book is unnecessarily crowded. Illustrations are supposed to elucidate the text, but some of these are so generalised (rural scene in China, Korean peasant houses) or so repetitious, as to be almost useless. There are nine pictures of one missionary in twenty pages, three of them full-page. One of these, showing two missionary bishops (p. 100) is almost exactly the same as that on page 52, where the life of the first bishop is being related.

Probably the most successful of these short biographies are those of the two members of the Legion of Mary, Edel Quinn and Alfie Lambe. But in general it is difficult to know for whom the book is intended. It is too grown-up for children, too naive for adults with sufficient education to read it.

Undaunted Spirit tells the story of the early settlers in Western Australia, and in particular of Joseph T. Reilly (1836 - 1915), grandfather of the author. His valuable *Reminiscences* (1903) on which the book is largely based is now difficult to come by.

O'Reilly was born in Dublin, where his father was stationed as a soldier. The family migrated to Western Australia when the colony was still in its infancy. As the story of early settlers, some of whom were ex-convicts, the book provides a certain fascination. Slowly told, perhaps, and not over-full of startling events; but that was how the colony developed.

There is a particularly interesting chapter on the early struggles of the Catholic Church in the colony, including ecclesiastical rivalry of the sort that people prefer to cover up; growing pains repeated elsewhere in the world. The infant Church weathered its early storms, and the cathedral in Perth must have been one of the first churches in the

world to have been dedicated to the Immaculate Conception, six months before the doctrine was defined in 1854.

We cannot end this short review without quoting a story about the author's mother, then a child of ten. She had a certain musical talent, and one day the Bishop came into the house when she was playing the piano. "That little girl has talent", he said, "I will teach her how to play the organ". Her mother was not impressed. "The organ is not a ladylike instrument. You cannot play it without showing your ankles". "Rubbish", said the bishop, and the little girl had her first organ lesson in the cathedral that day.

Francis Fenn, S.J.

AUGUSTINE PUBLISHING CO.
Chulmleigh, Devon EX18-7HL, U.K.

Three new pamphlets by Michael Davies

An Open Lesson to a Bishop

The Vatican II Declaration on Religious Liberty stated that no one was "to be restrained from acting in accordance with his own beliefs, whether privately or publicly", providing there is no breach of public order. But Archbishop Lefebvre believes this Declaration conflicts with previous papal teaching, and refused to sign it.

Michael Davies explains why.

20 pages 35p + 15p p/p = TOTAL 50p

Communion under Both Kinds

Cites the Canons of Trent anathematizing the Protestant claim that Communion under both kinds is a commandment from God, and shows how the bishops of the USA have yielded to the pressure of liturgical anarchists in sanctioning the abuse in open defiance of the Holy See.

24 pages 35p + 15p p/p = TOTAL 50p

An Open Lesson to a Bishop

A brief history of the Roman Rite, written to distinguish between true and false liturgical development, in the form of a reply to the misleading article of a bishop seeking to discredit Catholic traditionalists and the case for the Tridentine Mass.

36 pages 40p + 15p p/p = TOTAL 55p

THE ARRIVAL

Old Fr. Jo.
Lay quietly
On his death-bed
Wondering what account
He would make to the Lord.

So much of his priesthood
Seemed . . . what's the word?
TATTY!

Like the environs
Of the city where he had spent
His working days—grimy,
Down-at-heel,
Not much to be proud of.

Would the entrance to Glory
Be painful, purgatory in mid-flight?

Well, he did not have long enough
To answer his own awesome questions.
He slept gently into death.

Then he felt his soul
Swooping like a falcon to God,
Falling with all the awful power of love
To infinitude.

And there was Peter,
Sudden, comfortable, smiling.

And he said to Jo
'Do you feel ready?'
Like a hart
Panting for the water-brooks
Jo wanted to shout 'Yes! Yes!'
But he said 'No,
I'll wait quietly outside
And hear confessions'.

Frank Rickards

WORLD REJECTS THE TRENT MASS

You remember this notorious banner-headline in the *Universe* for January 1st of this year, 1982?

You remember the disgust it brought to so many Catholics?

You remember what the write-up introduced by this headline purported to do? Nothing less than to bury the Old Mass and, with it, the hopes of millions.

In the forthcoming, MAY, number of *Christian Order*, Alfred Marnau, Chairman of the Latin Mass Society, dissects the figures on which the *Universe* attempted to rest its unlovely case.

In the same issue, Michael Davies, in an open letter to the Editor, tears apart the figures, the facts that lie behind them and the mentality that gave them birth.

There will be a very heavy demand for this issue of *Christian Order*. If your renewal is overdue and unpaid, make sure of the May number by renewing at once. When you have read it, pass it, please, to your friends. It is time the true facts were known.